

REMARKS

Applicants express appreciation for the Examiner's time in granting an interview with Applicants' attorney D'Ann Naylor Rifai on October 24, 2003. The rejections of claims 1, 10, and 14 were discussed and a determination was made that Applicants should submit a request for reconsideration of the rejection of claims 10 and 14.

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. Claims 1-23 stand rejected. No amendments to the claims have been made. The specification and drawings have been amended to correct typographical errors. No new matter has been added.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 10 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Apte, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,256,772. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection.

Claim 10 is presented below:

10. A computer system comprising a first computer, where the first computer comprises:
- a plurality of plugin modules, including at least a first plugin module comprised of an introspection interface portion, an installation program component and a program behavior portion; and
 - a harness for evaluating the introspection interface portion of the first plugin module to determine if any resources are required for use of the program behavior portion of the first plugin module.

Applicants request clarification of the apparent inconsistency in the rejections of claims 1 and 10. With regard to claim 1, the Office Action states that "Apte does not specifically disclose an installation component that manages installation of the functional component." Office Action, page 4, paragraph 8. With regard to claim 10, however, the plug-in module including an installation program component is rejected as anticipated by

Apte. Applicants respectfully assert that Apte does not teach an installation program component of a plug-in module and that claim 10 is allowable. Accordingly, dependent claims 11-18 are also allowable.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 15 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Apte, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,256,772, in view of Barton, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,490,722. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is restated below:

1. An apparatus storing a computer-readable module for use in a host computer, where the module comprises:
 - a functional component for providing a predetermined programming functionality;
 - an installation component that manages installation of the functional component; and
 - a preprocessing interface component for providing introspective information about any requirements of the functional component in response to a request from the host computer.

On page 4, paragraph 8, the Office Action cites Barton column 2, line 31 through column 3, line 52 as teaching a software installation system that manages installation of functional components. Applicants agree that Barton teaches a separate software installation system that installs other software applications. The system of Barton is designed to provide error recovery when the installation of the software applications that it performs fails. Barton does not teach or suggest using the installation system as a component of another module that also includes the functional component to be installed and a preprocessing interface for providing introspective information about any requirements of the functional component. Because Barton teaches that a separate

system is needed for installing software applications, Barton teaches away from a self-contained module with both functional and installation components such as that claimed in claim 1. Barton, alone or in combination with Apte, does not teach all limitations of claim 1. As a result, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-9 are allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claims 6 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Apte, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,256,772, as applied to the base claim in view of Apte, U.S. Patent No. 6,298,353. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 outlined above. Claim 13 depends from claim 10 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 10 outlined above.

Claims 4, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Apte, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,256,772, as applied to the base claim in view of Goodisman, U.S. Patent No. 6,330,006. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1 outlined above. Claims 11, 12, 16, 17 and 18 depend from claim 10 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 10 outlined above.


Independent claim 19 is provided below:

19. A method of preprocessing a software module comprised of an interface portion and a program portion, comprising:
receiving a first software module;
querying the interface portion of the first software module to identify any
resources required by the program portion; and


installing the first software module if all resources required by the program portion are available.

The Office Action on page 10 cites Goodisman column 4:41-67 with reference to the receiving and installing elements of claim 19. Applicants have searched and can find no reference in the cited section to installing a software module, and particularly not in response to making a determination whether resources required by a program portion of the software module are available. As a result, Applicants respectfully assert that all elements of claim 19 are not taught by Goodisman, either alone or in combination with Apte et al., and that independent claim 19 and its dependent claims 20-23 are allowable.

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5080.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on <u>October 29, 2003</u> .	
 Attorney for Applicants	<u>10/29/03</u> Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



D'Ann Naylor Rifai
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 47,026
(512) 439-5086 (Phone)
(512) 439-5099 (Fax)